

## REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed 04/05/2006 applicant has canceled Claims 2 and 3 and entered new Claims 4, 5 and 6

The invention defines over the art as per the new claims. See the discussion submitted on pages 6 and 7 of the Amendment dated 10/07/2005 under the heading "Overview of the invention".

More particularly, regarding the rejection under 35 USC section 102 in view of the '895 reference, the new claims delineate specific structural limitations not shown nor suggested by the patent.


The apparatus disclosed in the '895 patent is retained in the framing of a boat as, for example, is disclosed in Figures 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent 4,993,346. (Copies attached) The adjustable outrigger holder devices shown in these patents transfer the weight of the outrigger holder to the indexing means when the indexing means is placed in use to rotate the outrigger holder. That is precisely the problem that applicants' apparatus is designed to solve. In applicants' apparatus the weight of the outrigger holder is carried by the bearings in the apparatus; not by the user. The user merely indexes the outrigger holder while the outrigger holder is supported by the bearings in the apparatus above the "T" top of the boat.

The claims now contain structural language to overcome the claim objections of the Examiner and the claim Rejections under 35 USC section 112.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger Wilcox et al

by 

Frank J. Benasutti, Esquire

Reg. No. 24,155

Attorney for Applicant

17294 Bermuda Village Drive